

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

After entry of this amendment, claims 1-40 and 69-72 will be pending in this application. New claims 69-72 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found in the specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,914,605 to Loughmiller et al. (Loughmiller). Reconsideration of these rejections and allowance of the pending claims in light of these remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 1

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Loughmiller. However, Loughmiller does not teach each and every element of this claim. For example, claim 1 recites "graphics circuitry configured to send and receive control signals over a set of control lines, said exchange governed by a communication protocol; the graphics circuitry configured to request orientation information via the set of control lines upon detecting a modulation of the set of control lines that is undefined by said communication protocol." Loughmiller does not provide this feature.

The pending office action cites Loughmiller, column 5, lines 39-66 as teaching these limitations. (See pending office action, page 2, fourth paragraph.) But Loughmiller does not teach detecting a modulation of the set of control lines that is undefined by said communication protocol.

Specifically, in Figure 5, Loughmiller teaches a computer 12 communicating with a display 36. (See Loughmiller, Figure 5 and column 12, lines 11-13.) The communication occurs over lines 42. (*id.*) This communication appears to follow a communication protocol. (See Loughmiller, column 11, lines 41-47.) But Loughmiller does not teach detecting a modulation that is undefined by this communication protocol. Accordingly, Loughmiller does not teach graphics circuitry configured to send and receive control signals over a set of control lines, said exchange governed by a communication protocol; the graphics circuitry configured to

request orientation information via the set of control lines upon detecting a modulation of the set of control lines that is undefined by said communication protocol, as is required by the claim.

The pending office action states that Loughmiller's console means 44 is equivalent to the claimed "communication protocol," and Loughmiller's display circuitry 40 is equivalent to the claimed "graphics circuitry." (See pending office action, page 3 lines 2-4.)

But Loughmiller teaches that the console means 44 is a user interface comprising a number of user operable buttons. (See Loughmiller, column 12, lines 27-34.) Console means 44 is not a communication protocol. Rather, the console means 44 communicates with interface card 32 of computer 12 over lines 48, and this communication likely uses a communication protocol. (See Loughmiller, Figure 5, column 12, lines 31-33.) However, Loughmiller does not teach detecting a modulation of the set of control lines that is undefined by this communication protocol.

Moreover, the display circuitry 40 cited by the pending office action communicates with display 36. (See Loughmiller, Figure 5, column 12, lines 11-13.) Again, this communication occurs over lines 42, likely using a communication protocol. (*id.*) But as discussed above, Loughmiller does not teach detecting a modulation of the set of control lines that is undefined by this communication protocol.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 should be allowed.

#### Other claims

Claims 12 and 24 should be allowed for similar reasons as claim 1.

Claims 35, 36, and 37 should be allowed for similar reasons as claim 1. For example, claim 35 recites "detecting a modulation of the set of control lines that is undefined by said master/slave communication protocol and not initiated by said graphics circuitry." Loughmiller does not teach this.

Claim 38, 39, and 40 should be allowed for similar reasons as claim 1. For example, claim 38 recites "detecting a modulation of the set of control lines that is defined as an illegal operation by said communication protocol." Loughmiller does not teach this.

Application number 10/772,195  
Amendment dated October 29, 2008  
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure  
Examining Group 2628

PATENT

The other claims depend on one of the above claims and should be allowed for at least the same reasons, and for the additional limitations they recite.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

/ J. Matthew Zigmant /

J. Matthew Zigmant  
Reg. No. 44,005

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 415-576-0200  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
Attachments  
JMZ:jmz  
61661177 v1